



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/621,881	07/17/2003	Deuk-Su Lee	250806-1300	8404

24504 7590 08/10/2006

THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP  
100 GALLERIA PARKWAY, NW  
STE 1750  
ATLANTA, GA 30339-5948

EXAMINER
----------

DUONG, TAI V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2871

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/621,881	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LEE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Tai Duong	<b>Art Unit</b> 2871	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 July 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

The rejections over Yee et al, Song and APA Figs. 1-3 are withdrawn in view of the amendments to the independent claims and Applicant's remarks regarding the recited features that the liquid crystal reverse region (first space) is larger than the liquid crystal non-reverse region (second space).

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: the reference number "70I" of Fig. 4. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 4, 7, 11, 12, 16, 17, 20, 23, 26, 30-32, 35 and 36 are *inconsistent* with the specification disclosure. As apparent from Figs. 5-7 and the specification, the first space S1 is the space between the *first* data bus line 66I and the periphery of the first pixel electrode layer 72I, and the *second* space S2 is the space between the *first* data bus line 66I and the periphery of the *second* pixel electrode layer 72II. However, claims 1 and 20 recite that the *second* space (S2) is the space between the second data bus line 66II and the periphery of the pixel electrode layer (the first pixel electrode layer 72I). In addition, there is an inconsistency between claims 4, 23 and the specification disclosure. The specification and Figs. 5-7 disclose a *first* light-shielding layer 74I is formed between the *first* data bus line 66I and the periphery of the *first* pixel electrode layer 66I, and a *second* light-shielding layer 74II is formed between the *first* data bus line 66I and the periphery of the *second* pixel electrode layer 72II. However, claims 4 and 23 recite that the second light-shielding layer 74II is formed between the second data bus line 66II and the periphery of the pixel electrode layer (the first pixel electrode layer 72I). The same issue of inconsistency between the claims and the specification disclosure is also applied to the second space, the second data bus line and the second light-shielding layer of claims 11, 12, 30 and 31. In claims 2, 12, 16, 21 and 31, line 3, it is unclear to which data bus line (first or second) the data bus line refers. Claims 7 and 26 are confusing because the first space, the second space, the liquid crystal non-reverse region and the liquid crystal reverse region are *already* recited in claims 1 and 20. Claims 17 and 36 are *inconsistent* with the specification disclosure. The specification discloses that the first overlapping width W1 is 6.5-7.5  $\mu\text{m}$  and the second

Art Unit: 2871


overlapping width W2 is 4.5~5.5  $\mu\text{m}$ , not W1 being 4~5  $\mu\text{m}$  and W2 being 2~3  $\mu\text{m}$  as recited in claims 17 and 36. Claim 32 is *inconsistent* with the specification disclosure. The specification discloses that the first space S1 is 4~5  $\mu\text{m}$  and the second space S2 is 2~3  $\mu\text{m}$ , not S1 being 6.5~7.5  $\mu\text{m}$  and S2 being 4.5~5.5  $\mu\text{m}$  as recited in claim 32. The remaining claims are also rejected since they depend on the indefinite claims.

Claims 1-38 are not indicated as allowed over the prior art of record because the intended scope of these claims is not clear for the reasons mentioned in the above 112 rejection.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-38 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Tai Duong at telephone number (571) 272-2291.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.



TVD

08/06

  
TOANTON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER